UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,465	08/20/2003	Henry Marshall Israel	2550-001	5945
	7590 04/15/200 INNEGAN, L.L.P.	8	EXAMINER	
3 WORLD FIN	ANCIAL CENTER		BACHMAN, LINDSEY MICHELE	
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/15/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOPatentCommunications@Morganfinnegan.com Shopkins@Morganfinnegan.com jmedina@Morganfinnegan.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/644,465	ISRAEL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LINDSEY BACHMAN	3734		

	LINDSEY BACHMAN	3734	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following r application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201122
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor 			cause
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, ,		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmen	it canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii submitted in a separate, t	intery filed afficianter	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	· -	l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>42-72</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•		
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Kevin T. Truong/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3734	
	i imary = Adminior, Art O	37 3 1	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Applicant's argument that Pinchasik'373 is not proper prior art, this argument will not be considered since Pinchasik'373 was used in the non-final rejection mailed 25 January 2007 and Applicant did not argue that the use of Pinchasik'373 was improper after the non-final rejection, it is considered a new argument that was not timely filed. See MPEP 716.01.

Regarding Applicant's arguments that it was NOT old and well known to use medical coatings on stents, Applicant did not argue this in the reply to the non-final rejection and it is considered an untimely filed argument and will not be considered. See above and MPEP 716.01. Regarding Applicant's argument that Pinchasik'373 does not teach a uniformly sized cell structure, this is not persuasive because the claim language does not require that all cells in the stent are uniformly sized, but only that the flexible connectors extending between sepentine sections form uniformly sized cells, which is indeed shown by Pinchasik'373, as discussed in the final rejection.